Regulation, but it is said that some documents are already held up.

Mr. A. Sankara Menon.—But this has no retrospective effect.

Motion put and carried.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I further move that the bill be taken up and passed to-morrow.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Municipal Regulation Amendment Bill (Section 56).

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Government consider that motor cars and other vehicles owned by the members of the Cochin Ruling Family for their personal use should be exempted from the payment of Municipal taxes and tolls. According to section 56 of the Cochin Municipal Regulation such exemptions may be granted by the Municipal Councils with the sanction of Government. Some Municipal Councils appear to be not in favour of granting such exemptions. Hence the amending bill.

Generally the practice has been that all vehicles maintained for the personal use of the members of the Ruling Family are exempted from tolls and taxes. But as stated in the 'objects and reasons' there has been some difficulty to persuade some Municipalities to allow such exemptions. Hence Government thought it better to amend the bill so as to give a general exemption without invoking the help of the Municipalities. I need not explain that the measure is necessary for maintaining the dignity and self-respect of the members of the Ruling Family.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Under this category what kinds of cars will come?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Cars used for personal use as distinguished from those used for hiring purposes. That is to say, for the personal locomotion of the members of his family, his freinds and relations, etc, just as any one of us use a car.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Can I register a car in my name and hand it over to any other man to be used for hiring purposes etc?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—That will not be considered as your personal use.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—May I know whether using by somebody else will be considered as personal use? Suppose a member of the Ruling Family has got half a dozen cars. Will all these be exempt?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—If a particular Prince can afford to maintain half a dozen cars for his personal use they will all have to be exempted.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Suppose a member of the Ruling Family owns a car and keeps it for hiring purposes. Will it be exempt?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—If he owns such a car that will not come under this.

Dr. A. R Menon.—Suppose a Prince has got a cycle which is used by one of his servants?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I do not think that will come under this. Sir, I am afraid there exists some misunderstanding or doubts among the Hon'ble Members. I can only say that Government have implicit trust in the words of every member of the Royal Family. Government is aware that no member of the Ruling Family will abuse the privilege which is intended to be extended to them. I am sure the Hon'ble Members also will agree there. In introducing such a measure the Government is to be governed by such considerations and I feel sure that Hon'ble Members will have absolutely no reason for regret. It may be the Hon'ble members may see a party who is not a member of the Royal Family driving in a motor car owned by a Prince. That will not be anything extraordinary. A Prince may of course keep more than one car if he can afford to do that. But if any one of these is let on hire then certainly it will not come under this clause. The regulation will exempt only if the car is used for *bona fide* personal use of the members of the Royal Family.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Have you made these Princes understand what your intentions are?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I dare say they know it very well.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Suppose a Prince has got nine children and the Prince purchases nine cars for the use of his children. Will you consider it as personal use or not?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—If a Prince has got such a large family and if he has the means to keep so many cars he may do so provided all these cars are used for the bonafide personal use of the members of his family.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—On a point of order. We are on the stage of introduction of the bill and the bill is not read in Council. Now we are discussing the provisions of the bill. We are not given the opportunity either to pass or oppose the bill.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I am only asking certain questions for information.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Deputy President.—Hon'ble members can ask questions for information.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—With regard to this question it is rather difficult to answer. Nevertheless I will make an attempt. The phrase used is 'for the personal use of the Princes'. Now personal use may include use by the children of the Princes also. But it will be different if the son is employed away and not living with the father, in which case, I am inclined to think, that the use of the car by that son may not come under this provision.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—Suppose the son is employed here and not living with the father.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—If the son is living with the father and use the car then it will come under this. But if a car is exclusively set apart for the son who is not living with the father, such a case may not come under this provision.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Was there any representation from the Princes to the Government for this exemption?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I should think there was.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—If persons other than the wife or children of a Prince drive in a car without a member of the Royal Family will they also enjoy the concession?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Suppose a member of the Royal Family is unwell and a servant is rushed to a doctor. This amendment is intended only to cover bona fide personal uses.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Who are the members of the Royal Family?

Mr Thomas Manjuran.—The Princes and Princesses of the Cochin Royal House.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—The whole difficulty seems to be centered upon two phrases 'personal use' and 'members of the Royal Family'. As for 'Members of the Royal Family' there can be no question. Then the whole trouble comes with regard to personal use. It is a very wide term and interpretations can be put upon that in the best way that each can do. In my opinion the bona fide use of the members of the Royal Family include the use by their wives and children and even servants. All that is wanted by the Government is to give them that protection which they are legitimately entitled to. So far the Hon'ble members will have no objection. But their fear is only that under the guide of this legitimate due unfair use should not be made of it. In other words they should not turn this privilege into commercial purposes. Therefore what I say is that if in the select committee the wording can be changed by adding 'excluding commercial purposes' the whole trouble may come to an end.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. Barton Wright.—It means provided they all live under one roof. Suppose a Prince has several children and they live in different places. Would they be entitled to this concession? I think it should apply only if all of them live under one roof.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Sir, I rise to oppose this bill. The reason why I oppose it is that if this bill is passed the Municipality will stand to lose heavily. It is against a good principle and this House should realise in passing such bills that even the poor rickshaw wallas are compelled to pay taxes and license fees. If it is so I fail to see why well-to-do people should be exempted merely on the ground that they are some way related to the Royal Family. You may after some time extend this also to those who are related to the Royal Family. We will pass this bill provided it is for the exclusive use of the members of the Royal Family and not the off-shoot. Now there will be no objection if that definition is accepted. Otherwise it will be difficult to pass this bill. There is no question of disloyalty. I am as loyal as any one of you. I am not going to vote blindly and allow people to take advantage of this measure. A person who can purchase a motor car must pay the taxes also. People who draw high salaries get exemption from this rule on the ground that they happen to be related with the Royal Family. This should not be. If that is the intention state boldly that it is your intention. We won't allow so many others to use the car under this pretence. Let the Government come forward and say that the definition covers their sons also. Then we must take that responsibility and join with the Government in passing this measure. But if on the other hand your intention is only to limit to the members of the Royal Family in that case also we will support this measure. But as it stands it is very difficult to support this measure. Therefore I oppose this bill.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—Sir, I also oppose this bill. I oppose the principle contained in it. I oppose it on the ground that it will deprive the Municipality of a good amount of money every year. The Municipality has to pay for providing many amenities which are enjoyed by the Princes and peasants alike. It is only proper that the princes should also pay in return. They are not exempted from water tax; they are not exempted from house tax; they are not exempted from land revenue. I cannot understand why they should be exempted from the payment of toll alone. There is absolutely no rhyme or reason for it. I do not think that any of the princes themselves will claim exemption from the payment of these small amounts. On this ground I differ from the Hon'ble Member for Cheruthuruthy. He is prepared to extend the conccession for the Princes and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Princesses, to the member of the Royal Family in a restricted sense. I am not prepared even for that. My position is that no single individual shouldbe exempted from the payment of this tax so long as he enjoys the amenities provided by the Municipality.

Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.—Are not members of the Royal Family already exempt from the payment of tolls?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Under the Municipal Regulation, the Municipalities can with the sanction of the Government exempt any class of members. Recently some difficulty arose because a particular Municipality has shown some reluctance in giving this concession. So it was thought better to introduce an amendment tothe Regulation.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. അയ്യപ്പൻ—ഞാൻ ഈ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. തമ്പുരാക്കന്മാർക്കു സൌജന്യം ചെയ്യുന്നതിലുള്ള വൈമനസ്യം കൊണ്ടല്ല. വാസ്തവത്തിൽനമ്മുടെ തമ്പുരാക്കന്മാർ മറ്റു ചില നാട്ടുരാജ്യങ്ങളിലെ തമ്പുരാക്കന്മാരെ അപേക്ഷിച്ചു വളരെ പുരോഗമിച്ച ചിന്താഗതി കൊണ്ടു കഴിയുന്നവരാണു്. ഞാൻ ബില്ലിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നതു മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റികൾക്കുള്ള വരവു മുതങ്ങാതിരിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശം കൊണ്ടാണു്. ഈ ബില്ലു് നിയമമായാൽ മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റികൾക്കു വലിയ നഷ്ടം നേരിടും. കാരുകൊണ്ടു മൂലം സാധാരണ ജനങ്ങൾ റോഡിൽവെച്ചു് വളരെ പൊടിതിന്നേണ്ടിവരുന്നുണ്ടു്. അതുവരാതെയിരിക്കാൻ റോഡുകൾ തരിക്കുന്നതിനാണം. അതിനു് മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റികൾക്കു പണം ആവശ്യമാണു്. രണ്ടു പേർ കാറിൽ സുഖമായി പോകുന്നതിനായിരം പേർ പൊടിതിന്നേണ്ടതായിട്ടാണു" ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അനുഭവം.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. എസ്സു്. കേശവൻനമ്പൂതിരി.—ഞാനും ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. പെഴ്സനൽയൂസു് എന്ന വാക്കു് ഇതിൽ വ്യക്തമാക്കിയിട്ടില്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണു് ഞാൻ ഇതിനെ എതിർക്കുന്നതു്. ഇപ്പോൾ എനിക്കു ഒരു കാറുണ്ടെന്നു വിചാരിയ്ക്കുക. അതു് എന്റെ ഭാര്യാമക്കൾക്കും സ്നേഹിതന്മാർക്കും ഉപയോഗിക്കാനായിട്ടു് വാട്ടകൊടുത്താൽ അവർ പ്രത്യേക നിയമത്തിനു് അടിമപ്പെടേണ്ടതായി വരും. എന്നാൽ ഞാൻ ഇരുന്നിട്ടു് കുറെ ആളുകളെ കയറ്റിക്കൊണ്ടു പോകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതിനു" യാതൊരു വിരോധവുമില്ല. അങ്ങിനെ വരുന്നതെല്ലാം പേഴ്സനൽ യൂസിൽ ഉൾപ്പെടുന്നതാണു്. അല്ലാപ്പോലെ ഒരു തമ്പുരാന്റെ കാറിൽ തമ്പുരാൻ ഉള്ളപ്പോൾ അതിനു് ചുങ്കം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതില്ല എന്നുള്ളതിനു് എനിയ്ക്കു് അഭിപ്രായവ്യത്യാസമില്ല. തമ്പുരാനില്ലാതെ ആരെങ്കിലും കയറിപോകുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ചുങ്കം ചുമത്തേണ്ടതു് ആവശ്യമാണു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു് മുനിസിപ്പാലിറ്റിക്കുള്ള ആദായം കുറക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലെന്നാണു് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.- While I yield to none in my abiding loyalty to the Cochin Royal Family, I am inclined to think that the Bill is ill-conceived and ought to be opposed. It affects only Municipal revenue. If a member of the Royal Family owns a pony, the Municipal charges have to be paid; when such a member owns a dog, the Municipal assessment has to be paid; but it is now proposed that when such a member owns a car a vehicle registered in his name, he should not pay any Municipal toll. That is not fair. I am personally one who would vote for any expenditure from the revenues of the State to purchase vehicles for their use to keep up their status. That is a different matter. There are cars now meant for the use of the members of the Royal House and the Government cars of that description are exempt. Government brings in this bill only to deprive the Municipalities of the tolls. What about other tolls. There are tolls outside the limit of the Municipality; are they not paying those tolls?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—No, they are already exempt from those.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—I think there is no meaning in giving this concession to the Princes. Government does not exempt such cars from the registration fees. A Prince has to submit to all the other rules in the motor regulation which any ordinary man has to submit to. I do not see any justification for such exemption. All vehicles intended for the personal use of the members of the Royal Family should be exempt from the Municipal tax. The present proposal would tell upon the Municipal revenue. Where a Prince purchases a car as a luxury, it is only in the fitness of things he should pay the Municipal toll. Even poor rickshaw wallas are compelled to pay the taxes. A Prince has to pay house-tax, water-tax, and professional tax like any ordinary municipal resident. There is no special reason why the members of the Royal Family should be exempted in this behalf. It will tell upon the Municipal Revenues and there is no justification for it. It is not a case of the Government supplying a car to a Member of the Royal family, and that car is sought to be exempted. It is the case of a Prince purchasing a car for his luxury. Even riksha walias have to pay the Muncipal tolls. I therefore beg to point out that this is not an exemption which ought to be granted to anybody. There is no special reason why a Prince of the Royal Family should be exempted in this behalf.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—May I know from the Secretary to the Diwan whether State Cars are exempted from Registration Fees?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I suppose this also includes the Cranganur Royal Family. There was an amendment to that effect.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Only Cochin Ruling Family. There is no Cranganur Ruling Family.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—Are they not also Ruling Family?

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—I want notice.

Deputy President.—This is not question time, to say I want notice.

Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.—I have not got the necessary information and so am not now in a position to give the necessary information asked for.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I think the Hon'ble Members are not keeping in mind the one imporant fact, when we speak of other duties and other taxes like the water-tax, house-tax, tax on dogs, etc., etc., it is not to save money for the Palace or the Prince that the provision is intended, but it is to save the Royal Princes and Princesses the indignity of being held up on the way as they go along public roads of the State. That is the idea. One of the objects of this legislation is to achieve that end.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—Suppose a Prince holds a coach and pair. Does it come under this?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—Yes. It is a vehicle. That I submit is one of the main ideas of this legislation. The provision applies any of the cases of cars personally used by the Princes and Princesses. Cars which bear the sign of the Palace may very often be used by the members of the household of the Prince. It will be rather difficult for the Prince to refuse or prevent such use. I find from the discussion that the House want to consider the amendment in detail. If the Hon'ble Members desire so, we may have a select committee to go into the whole questions. Government wants to protect the members of the Royal Family from the indignity of being stopped on the way. There are several other considerations also. It would be very unpleasant for me to go into a detailed examination of all those matters here. I would ask the Hon'ble Members to allow the passing of the first reading of the bill and I shall then move that the bill to referred to a select committee. I may say once more that this is a measure intended to safeguard the self respect and dignity of our Ruling Family.

Motion put and carried.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—The title of the bill is the Cochin Municipal Regulation Amendment Bill (section 56.)

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I move that the bill may be referred to a select committee consisting of the Deputy President, the Diwan Peishkar, Mr. K. Ayyappan, Dr. A. R. Menon, Messrs. M. Krishna Menon, P. Krishna Menon, M. A.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Chakko, C. Barton Wright, Government Advocate and Commissioner of Police.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Deputy President.—I appoint the Deputy President as the Chairman of the committee. The committee is to report within three months.

Municipal Regulation Amendment Bill. (Schedule IV).

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—This amending bill is obviously non-controversial. It is only to amend the Schedule IV of the Municipal Regulation. The language of the schedule as it now stands, refers to ten persons. As the language now stands, the conductor and the driver are being considered as being included in the ten persons. This language has given rise to considerable complaints. Some amelioration is necessary. Under this amendment a motor bus which carries ten passengers together with the driver and the conductor will have to pay only 12 annas toll instead of Rs. 2 which is now being charged. I am sure the Hon'ble Members will unanimously accept this bill.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Secretary to the Council.—The title of the bill is 'the Cochin Municipal Regulation Amendment Bill (schedule IV).'

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I further move that Standing Order 32 may be suspended and the bill be taken into consideration forthwith.

M. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Mr. A. Sankara Poduval.—May I know whether this will apply to eight seater buses?

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—This will apply to buses which carry less than 10 passengers.

Motion put and carried.

Mr. Thomas Manjuran.—I further move that the bill be taken up and passed to-morrow.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Resolutions.

1. Full Pension to Copyists.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. കുമാരനെഴുത്തച്ഛൻ.—സാർ, ഞാൻ ഇവിടെ അവതരിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നപ്രമേയം എന്താണ്ടു് മനസ്സിലാക്കുവാൻ അടുത്തതായിട്ടുള്ള—കൊച്ചീ രാജ്യത്തെ വളരെ അധികകാലംസേവചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള—പന്ത്രണ്ടോളംകൊല്ലം കാര്യത്തെപ്പറ്റി ശമ്പളമെന്നുണ്ടു് അല്പം മയപ്പെടുത്തി ഒന്നു് ആലോചിക്കണം എന്നുള്ളതാണു്. റസല്യൂഷൻ ഇതാണു്.—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly